



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/696,882	10/26/2000	William A. Wandersleben	11636-002001	3702

28765 7590 12/24/2003  
WINSTON & STRAWN  
PATENT DEPARTMENT  
1400 L STREET, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3502

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, LE V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 12/24/2003

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

TS

# Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/696,882

Applicant(s)

WANDERSLEVEN ET AL.

Examiner

Le Nguyen

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment AB, filed 10/15/03.
2. Claims 1-22 are pending in this application; claims 1 and 12 are independent; claims 1, 7, 12 and 19 have been amended.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

4. Claims 1-6, 8-18 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Watson et al. ("Watson", US 5,912,666).

As per claim 12, Watson teaches a computer program residing on a computer-readable medium that provides a method for automatically dismissing option information, the program comprising instructions for causing a computer to:

display a workspace on a computer screen, the workspace having at least one toolbar including a plurality of icons that each represents a tool wherein a non-modal dialog box is displayed within the workspace when an icon is chosen (fig. 8; *workspace with toolbar 830 comprising a plurality of tool icons and a non-modal dialog box associated with an icon*); and

hide the non-modal dialog box when an icon is chosen when a preferences option is enabled and a cursor is moved outside the boundaries of the non-modal dialog box to maximize the amount of available workspace on the computer screen for displaying work and restore the

Art Unit: 2174

non-modal dialog box when a restore action occurs (fig. 8; col.8, line 31; *consistent with the definition of pull-down menus is its ability to remain available as long as a user holds it open*).

As per claim 13, Watson teaches a computer program residing on a computer-readable medium to include instruction to permit a user to disable and enable the preference option (col. 11, lines 43-44).

As per claims 14 and 15, Watson teaches a computer program residing on a computer-readable medium wherein the restore action comprises moving the cursor over a predetermined hot-spot on the workspace and the hot-spot includes at least one of a tool icon and a preference option icon (figs. 8 and 13; col. 11, lines 11-12).

As per claim 16, Watson teaches a computer program residing on a computer-readable medium wherein at least one hot-spot can be moved to a location anywhere on the workspace (col. 9, lines 57-62).

As per claim 17, Watson teaches a computer program residing on a computer-readable medium wherein the restore action is entry of a key combination (fig. 4; col. 9, lines 41-43).

As per claim 18, Watson teaches a computer program residing on a computer-readable medium wherein the cursor is centered on the restored dialog box (col. 1, lines 48-49; *wherein centering is inherent in order for users to move cursors across applications and across partitions*).

As per claim 20, Watson teaches a computer program residing on a computer-readable medium comprising instructions enabling a user to customize the preference option (col. 9, lines 52-56).

As per claim 21, Watson teaches a computer program residing on a computer-readable medium wherein a preference option properties dialog box including at least one customizable feature is provided (col. 9, lines 58-60).

As per claim 22, Watson teaches a computer program residing on a computer-readable medium wherein the customizable features include at least one of a choice of a choice of a large or small preference option box, a choice of automatically positioning a tool settings dialog, a new tool delay time, and a hide dialog delay time (fig. 8; col. 9, lines 62-63; *customizable features such as a choice of a large or small preference option box such as depicted in top right corner of 830*).

Claim 1 is similar in scope to claim 12 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 2 and 3 are individually similar in scope to individual claims 14 and 15 respectively and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 4 is similar in scope to claim 16 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 5 is similar in scope to claim 17 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 6 is similar in scope to claim 18 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 8 is similar in scope to claim 13 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 9 is similar in scope to claim 20 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 10 is similar in scope to claim 21 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 11 is similar in scope to claim 22 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. Claims 7 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watson et al. ("Watson", US 5,912,666) in view of Screen Dumps of Microsoft Excel 2000 ("MS Excel").

As per claim 19, Watson teaches a computer program residing on a computer-readable medium wherein the restore action is entry of a key combination (fig. 4; col. 9, lines 41-43). Watson does not explicitly disclose repeating the key combination to hide the dialog box. MS Excel teaches a computer program residing on a computer-readable medium wherein the restore action is entry of a key combination and repeating the same key combination hides the dialog box (figs. 2-5; *depicts the use of the same key combination ALT+F11 to open and to hide a dialog box*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include MS Excel's teaching of repeating a key combination to hide a dialog box to Watson's teaching of a restore action comprising entry of a key combination in order to allow users control of a computer action without having to remember additional commands.

***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed in Amendment B have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued the following:

Watson's use of pull-down menus does not anticipate pending claims 1 and 12 to maximize the available workspace on the computer screen by hiding a non-modal dialog box when a cursor moves off a frame of the dialog box. Moreover, Applicant is of the opinion the

Art Unit: 2174

definition of a pull-down menu is that the menu remains open when the cursor is moved off of its frame and that the user must click the left mouse button or perform some other key function in order to dismiss the pull down menu.

The Examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

Applicant's definition is consistent with the definition of a drop-down menu, *i.e.* the definition of a drop-down menu being a menu that opens up when requested and remains open without further action until the user closes it or chooses a menu item. However, Watson teaches pull-down menus (fig. 8; col. 8, line 31), and by definition, pull-down menus remain available as long as the user holds it open (*i.e. it remains open as long as the cursor is still hovering over the dialog box*). Therefore, the non-modal dialog box is automatically dismissed when a cursor moves off of the frame of the non-modal dialog box.

### ***Inquires***

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lê Nguyen whose telephone number is **(703) 305-7601**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 am to 5:00 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 746-7238 [After Final Communication]

(703) 872-9306 [Official Communication]

(703) 746-7240 [For status inquiries, Draft Communication]

Application/Control Number: 09/696,882

Page 7

Art Unit: 2174

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Lê Nguyen  
Patent Examiner  
December 11, 2003

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100